DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 093 RE 004 088

AUTHOR	Boldovici, John A.; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental Program.
INSTITUTION	American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Pittsburgh, Pa.
REPORT NO	AIR-24900-11-71-FR
PUB DATE	Nov 71
NOTE	71p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Childrens Books; Community Cooperation; Community Involvement; *Demonstration Programs; Library Extension; *Program Evaluation; Reading Development; *Reading Habits; Reading Interests; Reading Materials; *Reading Programs; School Community Cooperation
IDENTIFIERS	*Reading is FUNdamental

ABSTRACT

A study of one of the model "Reading is FUNdamental" (RIF) programs located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, was made to determine the success of the program and to formulate suggestions for changes. RIF is a program in which free or inexpensive books are made available in a community through schools, libraries, and other local organizations in order to encourage reading for enjoyment. For this study, questionnaires given to students, parents, teachers, principals, librarians, and student aides were evaluated. It was found that the overall reaction to the program was favorable. Children found the books were fun to read and they enjoyed sharing them with their families and friends; teachers and librarians felt the program had helped motivate children to read and resulted in positive effects which could be seen in the classroom and the library; parents found their children reading and enjoying books; principals felt the program should be continued; and student aides felt that their home visitations and individual work with children were valuable to the children and to themselves. Suggestions for changing the program, a survey of books distributed by subject and reading level, sample questionnaires, tables, and references are included. (AL)

ED 062093

AIR-24900-11/71-FR

An Evaluation of

The Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental Program

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

John A. Boldovici
Michael Rosenfeld
Ronald Wilkes

American Institutes for Research
710 Chatham Center Office Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

November 1971

RE004 088

INTRODUCTION

The Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) Project was originated in Washington, D. C. in 1966 by Mrs. Robert S. McNamara and a group of citizens interested in providing increased opportunities for inner-city children to own and read books for pleasure. An evaluation of the Washington project indicated that RIF had succeeded in stimulating interest in books and reading in many children who had previously been indifferent to books.

Upon examining the goals, procedures, and evaluation results of the Washington project, the Ford Foundation supplied funds for the expansion of RIF to cities and rural areas in other parts of the country. Pittsburgh was selected in the fall of 1969 as one of the cities for a model RIF project. Representatives from Chatham College, the Urban League of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Board of Public Education, and the community formed the Reading is FUNdamental Board of Directors. The project was implemented in six neighborhoods with median annual family incomes of $5,000 or less.

The Pittsburgh RIF program as originally conceived had two overall goals:

1. To increase the amount of recreational reading done by participants as a result of freedom to select books in a variety of subject areas.

2. To promote pride in ownership of books resulting in the purchase of additional books or use of books from other sources.

Recognizing the value of objectively demonstrating the attainment of program goals, and the possibility of modifying the program for increased effectiveness, the RIF staff has engaged in a continuing program of independent evaluation. Morgan (1970) conducted the first evaluation of the Pittsburgh RIF program, and concluded:

> "...the RIF program in Pittsburgh has been a success in terms of the original goals. Children are doing additional recreational reading because of and even beyond their RIF books. In addition, these students are demonstrating pride in the ownership of their books and seem interested in acquiring additional books to own. If this should lead to further action as a result of the program, such action might well take the form of aiding teachers to understand how the program can be of value in their classrooms. The RIF program will enjoy even greater success if it leads to further actions to aid academic success for the children who participated in the program" (p. 13).

The second phase of the RIF program continued in Pittsburgh, with modifications based on the results of the first year's experience. A contract was awarded early in 1971 to the American Institutes for Research (AIR), for the purpose of conducting a second program evaluation. Following are the Summary and Conclusions of their report.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Personnel from the Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) Program, and from the American Institutes for Research (AIR) cooperated in specifying RIF program objectives. Questionnaires relating to the RIF objectives were then designed and administered to students, teachers, principals, librarians, and parents of RIF participants. Interviews were held with students and parents, and experiments were conducted to examine possible differential effects of reading achievement and home visits by Student Aides upon the numbers of books read and the number of books started but not completed by RIF recipients. Additional data were collected from student book reports, Student Aide home-visit reports, and analyses of the numbers and kinds of books distributed by RIF. The results of the study indicated that:

1. The Pittsburgh RIF program was responsible for the distribution of nearly 80,000 books from September 1970 to June 1971. This distribution was made possible, not only the the efforts of the program staff, but also by the cooperation and participation in the program by school and community people.

2. The students who participated in the RIF program enjoyed owning and reading their books, which received considerable circulation beyond their immediate recipients: Questionnaire responses indicated that the number of readers of the RIF books was at least double the number of recipients. The responses of the RIF recipients to the Student Questionnaire were overwhelmingly positive. Two of every three students, however, reported having had a "hard time" finding books at RIF that they wanted to read. The reason for this result was not entirely clear: Ambiguity of a questionnaire item, and specificity of students' interests are offered as possible interpretations.

3. Teachers agreed that the RIF program was worthwhile, increased students' enjoyment of reading, and helped to motivate students to read. All members of the teacher sample encouraged their students to select and read RIF books. Eight of every ten teachers reported having used RIF books in their classroom activities.

4. The principals of the participating schools would like to see RIF continued in their schools, and agreed that the program encouraged students to read, helped make reading enjoyable, and increased the variety of books available to students in their schools.

5. Librarians agreed that RIF had helped motivate students to read, and that the program had been successful.

6. Parents of RIF recipients held favorable opinions of the program. All improvements suggested by parents pertained to continuation or expansion of the program.

7. Home visits by Student Aides affected significantly the mean number of books read by students who received the visits, as compared with students who did not; and had no significant effect upon the mean number of books started but not completed by the two groups. The Student Aides were uniformly enthusiastic and optimistic about the effectiveness of their efforts, for which some would like more training and others more pay.

8. Whether or not students were in the upper or lower halves of their classes in reading achievement, as indicated by teacher ratings, did not differentially affect the numbers of books read or the number read and not completed; that is, equal numbers of books were read and completed by high-rated and low-rated leaders.

9. The number of books purchased by RIF participants was differentially related to whether or not students were rated as being in the upper or lower halves of their classes in reading achievement; high-rated readers bought more books than low-rated readers.

PREFACE

This report was written at the end of a project to evaluate the Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental program. The purpose of the report is to describe the procedures and results of the study, and to suggest possible ways to increase the effectiveness of Reading is FUNdamental.

The investigators are grateful for the assistance of the students, parents, teachers, librarians, and principals who served as subjects for the study. Funds for the conduct of the program were provided by the National Office of Reading is FUNdamental, and the Buhl Foundation.

Special thanks are due to Mary Jane Duda of the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education, and David Henderson of the Buhl Foundation.

The patience and administrative assistance of Austina Bradley and Lavera Brown of the Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental staff made performance of the project not only possible, but also enjoyable. That they succeeded in obtaining the cooperation of all parties involved in the study is a factor that should not be ignored in evaluating the program.

Several staff members of the American Institutes for Research participated in conducting the evaluation. Michael Rosenfeld designed and directed the study with assistance from Ronald Wilkes. Marjorie Salley conducted interviews; Wannehma Henderson and Karen Trocki assisted in data collection. John A. Boldovici performed the data analysis and wrote this report.

CONTENTS

	page
PREFACE	ii
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	1
INTRODUCTION	4
OVERVIEW OF METHOD	7
Program Objectives	7
Questionnaires	7
Sampling and Data Collection	7
Supplementary Procedures	10
RESULTS	13
Distribution	13
Student Questionnaires	16
Student Interviews	19
Teacher Questionnaires	21
Principal Questionnaires	28
Librarian Questionnaires	33
Parent Questionnaires	35
Effects of Home Visits	38
Effects of High and Low Reading Achievement	41
Ancillary Data	42
RECOMMENDATIONS	45
APPENDIXES	A-1
REFERENCES	

List of Tables

Table 1.	Objectives of the Pittsburgh RIF Program	8
Table 2.	Student Questionnaire Sample, by Grade Levels and Schools.	9
Table 3.	Summary of RIF Book Distribution	14
Table 4.	RIF Books: Distribution of Titles with Content Categories and Grade Levels	15
Table 5.	Student Questionnaire Summary	17
Table 6.	Student Interview Summary	20
Table 7.	Teacher Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items	22
Table 8.	Teacher Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Close-Ended Questions	23
Table 9.	Principal Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items	29
Table 10.	Librarian Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items	34
Table 11.	Parent Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Close-Ended Items	36

List of Appendixes

Appendix A.	Student Questionnaire	A-1
Appendix B.	Teacher Questionnaire	B-1
Appendix C.	Principal Questionnaire	C-1
Appendix D.	Librarian Questionnaire	D-1
Appendix E.	Parent Questionnaire	E-1
Appendix F.	Schools Participating in the Pittsburgh RIF Program	F-1
Appendix G.	Numbers of RIF Books Available by Categories by Reading Levels	G-1

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Personnel from the Pittsburgh Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) Program, and from the American Institutes for Research (AIR) cooperated in specifying RIF program objectives. Questionnaires relating to the RIF objectives were then designed and administered to students, teachers, principals, librarians, and parents of RIF participants. Interviews were held with students and parents, and experiments were conducted to examine possible differential effects of reading achievement and home visits by Student Aides upon the numbers of books read and the number of books started but not completed by RIF recipients. Additional data were collected from student book reports, Student Aide home-visit reports, and analyses of the numbers and kinds of books distributed by RIF. The results of the study indicated that:

1. The Pittsburgh RIF program was responsible for the distribution of nearly 80,000 books from September 1970 to June 1971. This distribution was made possible, not only the the efforts of the program staff, but also by the cooperation and participation in the program by school and community people.

2. The students who participated in the RIF program enjoyed owning and reading their books, which received considerable circulation beyond their immediate recipients: Questionnaire responses indicated that the number of readers of the RIF books was at least double the number of recipients. The responses of the RIF recipients to the Student Questionnaire were overwhelmingly positive. Two of every three students, however, reported having had a "hard time" finding books at RIF that they wanted to read. The reason for this result was not entirely clear: Ambiguity of a questionnaire item, and specificity of students' interests are offered as possible interpretations.

3. Teachers agreed that the RIF program was worthwhile, increased students' enjoyment of reading, and helped to motivate students to read. All members of the teacher sample encouraged their students to select and read RIF books. Eight of every ten teachers reported having used RIF books in their classroom activities.

4. The principals of the participating schools would like to see RIF continued in their schools, and agreed that the program encouraged students to read, helped make reading enjoyable, and increased the variety of books available to students in their schools.

5. Librarians agreed that RIF had helped motivate students to read, and that the program had been successful.

6. Parents of RIF recipients held favorable opinions of the program. All improvements suggested by parents pertained to continuation or expansion of the program.

7. Home visits by Student Aides affected significantly the mean number of books read by students who received the visits, as compared with students who did not; and had no significant effect upon the mean number of books started but not completed by the two groups. The Student Aides were uniformly enthusiastic and optimistic about the effectiveness of their efforts, for which some would like more training and others more pay.

8. Whether or not students were in the upper or lower halves of their classes in reading achievement, as indicated by teacher ratings, did not differentially affect the numbers of books read or the number read and not completed; that is, equal numbers of books were read and completed by high-rated and low-rated leaders.

9. The number of books purchased by RIF participants was differentially related to whether or not students were rated as being in the upper or lower halves of their classes in reading achievement; high-rated readers bought more books than low-rated readers.

INTRODUCTION

The Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) Project was originated in Washington, D. C. in 1966 by Mrs. Robert S. McNamara and a group of citizens interested in providing increased opportunities for inner-city children to own and read books for pleasure. An evaluation of the Washington project indicated that RIF had succeeded in stimulating interest in books and reading in many children who had previously been indifferent to books.

Upon examining the goals, procedures, and evaluation results of the Washington project, the Ford Foundation supplied funds for the expansion of RIF to cities and rural areas in other parts of the country. Pittsburgh was selected in the fall of 1969 as one of the cities for a model RIF project. Representatives from Chatham College, the Urban League of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Board of Public Education, and the community formed the Reading is FUNdamental Board of Directors. The project was implemented in six neighborhoods with median annual family incomes of $5,000 or less.

The Pittsburgh RIF program as originally conceived had two overall goals:

1. To increase the amount of recreational reading done by participants as a result of freedom to select books in a variety of subject areas.

2. To promote pride in ownership of books resulting in the purchase of additional books or use of books from other sources.

Recognizing the value of objectively demonstrating the attainment of program goals, and the possibility of modifying the program for increased effectiveness, the RIF staff has engaged in a continuing program of independent evaluation. Morgan (1970) conducted the first evaluation of the Pittsburgh RIF program, and concluded:

> "...the RIF program in Pittsburgh has been a success in terms of the original goals. Children are doing additional recreational reading because of and even beyond their RIF books. In addition, these students are demonstrating pride in the ownership of their books and seem interested in acquiring additional books to own. If this should lead to further action as a result of the program, such action might well take the form of aiding teachers to understand how the program can be of value in their classrooms. The RIF program will enjoy even greater success if it leads to further actions to aid academic success for the children who participated in the program" (p. 13).

The second phase of the RIF program continued in Pittsburgh, with modifications based on the results of the first year's experience. A contract was awarded early in 1971 to the American Institutes for Research (AIR), for the purpose of conducting a second program evaluation, the procedures and results of which are described in the following sections of this report.

OVERVIEW OF METHOD

Program Objectives

Design of the evaluation began with a series of meetings between members of the RIF and AIR project staffs, during which objectives of the RIF program were specified, and priorities assigned to the objectives. Three classes of objectives for the RIF program emerged as a result of these meetings. The primary objectives related to student motivation to read, ownership of books, and enjoyment of reading. Secondary objectives involved the desired effects of the program upon teachers and parents. The student, teacher, and parent objectives are presented in Table 1.

Questionnaires

After the program objectives had been specified, attention was directed to devising efficient means for assessing progress toward achievement of the objectives. A decision was made early in the project to achieve the necessary confidence in the results of the evaluation by collecting similar data from a variety of sources, rather than by attempting to design and implement a precisely controlled experiment. The decision was based on several considerations including the large number of objectives to be covered by the evaluation, and temporal and fiscal constraints. Questionnaires relating to the RIF objectives were, therefore, designed for administration to students, teachers, principals, librarians, and parents of RIF participants. The draft questionnaires were reviewed by the RIF staff and by members of the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education. Sample copies of the questionnaires, which were revised on the basis of the reviews and used in the study, are attached as Appendixes A through E of this report.

Sampling and Data Collection

Permission to conduct the study was granted by the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education and by the principals of the participating schools.

The student sample was comprised of 444 respondents from three elementary schools, selected on the basis of size and location. A summary of this sample, by grade level, is presented in Table 2. In all cases, the questionnaires were read to the students by an AIR staff member in order to negate

TABLE 1

Objectives of the Pittsburgh RIF Program

Primary Objectives

Students

1. Provide students the opportunity to own books of their choice.
2. Develop in students the motivation to read.
3. Develop in students an enjoyment of reading.
4. Provide students the exposure and accessibility to a variety of books supplemental to those available in their school libraries.

Secondary Objectives

Teachers

1. Provide teachers the opportunity to make use of RIF books in the classroom.
2. Provide teachers the opportunity to encourage the reading of books of the students' choice.

Parents

1. Develop in parents an awareness of and interest in what their children are reading.
2. Develop in parents an awareness of the importance of reading in education.
3. Develop in the parent an appreciation of books.
4. Develop in parents the motivation to read.
5. Develop on the part of parents an awareness of the importance of encouraging their child to read.

TABLE 2

Student Questionnaire Sample, by Grade Levels and Schools

	Grade Levels												
	4			5			6			"Adjustments"*			
Schools	Baxter	Letsche	E. Park	Baxter	Letsche	E. Park	Baxter	Letsche	E. Park	Baxter	Letsche	E. Park	
Sample Sizes	93	20	18	107	20	27	97	26	13	23	0	0	
Totals	131			154			136			23			N=444

*"Adjustments" are pupils for whom teachers judge that remedial work is necessary.

possible effects of differences in reading comprehension upon the results of the study. Administrative details, such as the sizes of the groups taking the questionnaire, and the time of administration, were treated locally by teachers and principals

In addition to the 444 fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade questionnaire respondents, 28 first-, second-, and third-graders from one school were interviewed individually by a member of the AIR staff. The questionnaire format was used for the interviews, and probing questions were asked whenever the interviewer judged that a response warranted clarification.

One hundred twenty-five Teacher Questionnaires were distributed to eight elementary schools. Fifty-one teachers from seven schools responded to the questionnaire, the number of participating teachers from each school ranging from four to eleven. Administrative details, such as distributing the questionnaires, and communicating deadlines for completion were treated jointly by the AIR and RIF staffs, and the principals of the participating schools.

One copy of the Principal Questionnaire and one copy of the Librarian Questionnaire were distributed to each of 28 schools participating in the RIF program. Seventeen librarians and 21 principals responded.*

Twenty-two interviews were held with parents of RIF participants, using the Parent Questionnaire format shown in Appendix E.

Supplementary Procedures

In the course of designing the study, two questions arose in addition to those treated by the questionnaires. The first of these questions involved whether or not RIF benefited good readers more than poor readers. An experiment was therefore designed in which teachers assigned students to the upper and lower halves of their classes in reading achievement. The numbers of RIF books read by high-rated students were then compared to the numbers of RIF books read by low-rated students. Additional details of the experiment are presented in the Results section of this report (p. 41).

*After this report was drafted the investigators were apprised that not all 28 schools had librarians. Determination of the total number was impossible before the report was printed. Computation of the amount by which the return rate for librarians exceeded 17/28, therefore, was also impossible.

The second question led to an examination of the effects of weekly visits to the homes of RIF recipients by Student Aides who listened to and helped children read their RIF books, discussed various aspects of reading with the children, responded to questions about the books and to requests for additional books, and generally assumed the role of parties greatly interested in the reading behavior of the RIF recipients. An experiment was designed to compare the numbers of books read by children who received the home visits from Student Aides to the numbers of books read by children who did not receive the visits. Telephone interviews were also held with the Student Aides, in order to determine their opinions of the effectiveness of the home visits.

RESULTS

Distribution

Books were distributed three times to each of the 28 participating elementary schools* during the school year beginning September 1970 and ending in June 1971. The arrival of the RIF bookmobile was advertised by posters in the schools, announcements by teachers, and letters given to students for delivery to their parents. Children were brought to the bookmobile by class and allowed to browse and select books of their choice. RIF staff members and parent volunteers were available to help guide the students through the bookmobile. During these distributions 59,109 free books were given to children and 20,133 were purchased. Table 3 provides a summary of the number of books distributed: 212 parents and 403 teachers purchased books, and nearly half of the students in the 26 schools in which books were sold purchased 20,133 books.

Table 4 is a summary of the number and variety of available books by reading level. Over 1,000 titles in a variety of content categories were available to students in the RIF program.

*A list of participating schools is presented as Appendix F.

TABLE 3

Summary of RIF Book Distribution

(September 1970 to June 1971)

Purchased Books		
Number of schools participating	26	
Total Enrollment	13,062	
Number of children purchasing/ number of books	6,137	17,049
Number of teachers purchasing/ number of books	403	2,032
Number of parents purchasing/ number of books	212	1,052
Total Purchasers	6,752	
Total Books Purchased		20,133

Free Books		
Number of schools participating	28	
Total Enrollment	13,419	
Number of books given to children		58,664
Number of books given to parents		445
Total Free Books		59,109
TOTAL DISTRIBUTION		79,242 BOOKS

TABLE 4

*RIF Books: Distribution of Titles Within Content Categories and Grade Levels**

Reading Level	Number of Content Categories	Number of Titles
1	7	71
2	24	161
3	29	129
4	42	206
5	47	305
6	39	137
7	21	35

*Numbers are based on March 1971 RIF Book List.

Student Questionnaires

The major results of the Student Questionnaire, summarized in Table 5, were that:

1. Sixty-five percent of the 444 students in the sample reported that they did "have a hard time finding books at Reading is Fun that [they] wanted to read."

2. Ninety-six percent of the students reported having had fun reading the books that they chose.

3. Fifty-five percent of the students reported having tried to find, in the school library, books similar to their RIF choices; and 54 percent asked one of their parents or another adult to buy them more books.

4. Eighty-nine percent of the students reported having a special place to keep their books.

5. About 70 percent of the students indicated that they exchanged books with friends: 73 percent reported having read friends' books, and 68 percent reported having loaned books to friends.

6. Ninety percent of the students reported that at least one other member of their families had read their RIF books.

7. Of 667 responses to the question, "[Which] members of your families read your books, "* the majority (52 percent) mentioned siblings. Mothers were mentioned in 25 percent of the responses, fathers in 11 percent, "other relatives" (including one dog!) in 11 percent, and friends in 1 percent.

8. Seventy-one percent of the respondents said that they talked about their RIF books with friends.

9. Ninety-three percent reported that they like to read.

---

*The total number of responses (667) exceeded the total number of respondents (444) because many students gave more than one response to this question.

TABLE 5

Student Questionnaire Summary

Items:	Numbers		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Did you have a hard time finding books at Reading is Fun that you wanted to read?	290	154	65	35
2. Do you have fun reading the books you picked out?	427	17	96	4
3. Have you tried to find other books like them in the library?	243	201	55	45
4. Have you asked your mother or father or other grown-up person to buy you some more books?	241	203	54	46
5. Do you have a special place to keep your books?	396	48	89	11
6. Have any of your friends read your books?	300	144	68	32
7. Do you read their books?	326	118	73	27
8. Have any members of your family read your books?	400	44	90	10
9. Do you talk about the books with your friends?	316	128	71	29
10. Do you like to read?	412	32	93	7

Item 8b.	Mothers	Fathers	Siblings	Other Relatives	Friends
Other members of family who read RIF books.	168	71	347	73	8
Percent of total (667) responses to item 8b.	25	11	52	11	1

Interpreting children's responses to questionnaires is difficult. The results are undoubtedly influenced by respondents' perceptions of what constitutes "socially acceptable" or "correct" responses, as well as by individual differences in attitudes toward test-taking. The investigators are generally inclined to present the results as they occurred, interpret minimally, and let the reader draw his own conclusions. Despite this inclination, and recognizing that objective verification of any single interpretation would require a study comparable in magnitude to the present one, the investigators feel compelled to comment at least on overall trends and certain possible interpretations of the data.

Perhaps the most compelling impression given by the results of the Student Questionnaire is that the RIF books receive considerable circulation beyond their immediate recipients, as indicated by the responses to the questions on exchange of books between friends, and on family readership of books. The actual number of readers of RIF books seems to be at least double the number of recipients. Any evaluation of the RIF program in terms of per-pupil costs should take this datum into account.

Another overall impression given by the Student-Questionnaire results is that the respondents do indeed enjoy owning and reading the RIF books, as well as reading in general: In items 2 and 10, 96 percent of the respondents indicated that they had fun reading the RIF books, and 93 percent reported liking to read; items 3 and 4 indicated that over half of the students had actively sought to borrow or purchase additional books. Another indication of the value placed upon the RIF books by the recipients appears in item 5: 89 percent of the respondents reported having a special place to keep their books.

The high proportion of affirmative responses to item 1 of the Student Questionnaire was somewhat surprising, and was initially viewed by the investigators as a rather serious indictment of the RIF program. A closer examination of the item, however, revealed that it was extremely ambiguous and, as such, did not provide a solid basis for making judgments about the program. The exact wording of the item was, "Did you have a hard time finding books at Reading is Fun that you wanted to read?" The ambiguity here stems from: (1) the item's containing at least two questions ("Did you have a hard time finding the RIF books?"; and "Did you have a hard time finding

books that you wanted to read?"); and (2) multiple possible interpretations of "hard time finding." Examples of two such interpretations are: "Were specific titles or authors unavailable?"; and "Did you have difficulty selecting a book from the available ones?" Some clarification of this issue was provided during the Student Interviews in which the questionnaire format was used: Whenever a student indicated that he had had a hard time finding a book that he wanted to read, he was asked to explain why this was so. In almost every case the student reported that he or she had tried to find a book on a specific topic (for example, a sports book for sixth graders, or a "Peanuts" book), but was unable to do so. The 65 percent affirmative response to item 1, therefore, appears to have been due, not to any shortage of books, but to the students' inability to find books on a particular topic or field of interest. Additional analysis of the responses to this item indicated that the students' fields of interest tended to become more specific with increased grade level. The percentages of affirmative responses by grade level were 60 percent for the fourth grade, 65 percent for the fifth grade, and 74 percent for the sixth grade.

Student Interviews

The results of the Student Interviews, summarized in Table 6, generally paralleled the results of the Student Questionnaires. The most marked discrepancy between the two sets of data occurred in the responses to item 6: "Have any of your friends read your books?" Whereas 68 percent of the questionnaire respondents answered this item affirmatively, only half of the interviewees did so. The reason for this difference is unclear. On the one hand, it may be that first-, second-, and third-graders (who comprised the interview sample) are simply more reluctant to loan their possessions to friends than are fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders (who comprised the questionnaire sample). On the other hand, because of the small sample size (n=28) for the interviews, the responses may not have been representative of the data that would have been obtained using a larger sample.

Perhaps the primary value of the Student Interviews derived from the possibility of exploring the reasons that over half of the respondents reported

TABLE 6

Student Interview Summary

Items:	Numbers		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Did you have a hard time finding books at Reading is Fun that you wanted to read?	15	13	54	46
2. Do you have fun reading the books you picked out?	28	0	100	0
3. Have you tried to find other books like them in the library?	17	11	61	39
4. Have you asked your mother or father or other grown-up person to buy you some more books?	14	14	50	50
5. Do you have a special place to keep your books?	28	0	100	0
6. Have any of your friends read your books?	14	14	50	50
7. Do you read their books?	20	8	71	29
8. Have any members of your family read your books?	22	6	79	21
9. Do you talk about the books with your friends?	20	8	71	29
10. Do you like to read?	28	0	100	0

Item 8b.	Mothers	Fathers	Siblings	Other Relatives
Other members of family who read RIF books.	9	3	25	3
Percent of total (40) responses to item 8b.	22.5	7.5	62.5	7.5

having had difficulty in finding books that they wanted to read. As indicated in the discussion of the Student Questionnaire responses (pp. 18-19), this difficulty seemed not to be related to unavailability of books, but rather to the students' inability to find books in their particular areas of interest. This conclusion should, however, be regarded as tentative, and additional interviews should be conducted in order to ascertain the reasons for the reported difficulty.

Teacher Questionnaires

The Teacher Questionnaire was comprised of four kinds of items:

1. Five affirmative statements with which the teachers indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement on a five-point rating scale, using a rating of one for strong disagreement, and a rating of five for strong agreement.
2. Three close-ended, yes-or-no questions.
3. Two close-ended questions requiring numerical responses.
4. Seven open-ended questions.

Summaries of the teachers' responses to the rating-scale items and to the close-ended questions are presented in Tables 7 and 8. The mean ratings in Table 7 reflect considerable agreement (mean rating ≥ 4.0) by the teachers on the following propositions:

1. The RIF program increased students' enjoyment of books.
2. RIF helped to motivate students to read.
3. Ownership of books had a positive effect on students.
4. RIF is worthwhile.

The teachers agreed somewhat less strongly (mean rating = 3.75) that the RIF program helped to improve the reading performance of their students.

The responses to the close-ended questions summarized in Table 8 are straightforward:

1. Thirty-nine of the 50 teachers (78 percent) who responded to item 6 reported that they use the students' RIF selections as part of their classroom activities.

TABLE 7

Teacher Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items

Items:	Ratings: Strongly Disagree =1	Disagree =2	Neutral =3	Agree =4	Strongly Agree =5	No Response	Weighted Σ/N	$\bar{X}$ Rating
1. I think the RIF program has helped to improve the reading performance of my students.	1	1	17	21	1	1	188/50	3.75
2. I believe the RIF program has increased the students' enjoyment of books.	0	1	2	26	22	0	222/51	4.25
3. I think RIF has helped to motivate my students to read.	0	0	8	26	15	2	203/49	4.25
4. I think the ownership of books has a positive effect on my students.	1	0	9	22	18	1	206/50	4.00
5. I believe the RIF program is worthwhile.	0	0	1	16	31	3	222/48	4.50

Notes:

1. Cell entries are the numbers of teachers assigned to each item, the ratings appearing in the column headings.
2. Weighted Σ = Sum of the cell entries x rating value for each item; N = number of teachers responding to each item.
3. $\bar{X}$ ratings (=weighted Σ/N) rounded to nearest 0.25.

TABLE 8

Teacher Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Close-Ended Items

	Numbers		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
6. I use RIF books the children have selected as a part of my classroom activities.	39	11	78	22
7. I encourage my students to select and read RIF books.	50	0	100	0
8. Have parents commented about the RIF program?	9	42	18	82

2. All 50 teachers who responded to item 7 reported that they do encourage their students to select and read RIF books.

3. Nine of 51 teachers (18 percent) who responded to item 8 reported that parents had commented on the RIF program.

Only five teachers responded to the item, "approximate number of parents making favorable comments." Determination of how many parents had commented favorably on the program was therefore impossible. No unfavorable comments were reported.

The open-ended items of the Teacher Questionnaire are discussed in the following sections:

How has RIF helped to motivate students to read?

Eighteen teachers (35 percent of the sample of 51) did not respond to this item. The 33 teachers who did respond provided one answer each. Nineteen (56 percent) of these responses indicated that the question had been misinterpreted to ask "How do you know that RIF has increased students' motivation to read?" The responses to this item were therefore analyzed as though it were two separate items--the original item ("How has RIF helped to motivate students to read?"), and the item as misinterpreted ("How do you know that RIF has increased students' motivation to read?"). All 14 of the responses to the original item attributed increased motivation to read to the high interest value, the novelty of the RIF books (as compared to textbooks), or both. These responses imply a recognition by teachers that the RIF books, because they are different from and sometimes more interesting than textbooks, can serve as an important adjunct to the schools' efforts to teach reading.

As noted previously, 19 teachers responded to this item by citing indicators of increased motivation to read. The most frequently mentioned indicators were:

1. The expressed enthusiasm of students with respect to reading the RIF books, owning them, or both (37 percent of the 19 responses).

2. The voluntary exchange of books between students (21 percent).

3. The teachers' observations that students actually read their RIF books (16 percent).

The remaining 26 percent of the 19 responses to the item as misinterpreted were equally distributed among statements such as "Students want to read more"; "Students show more interest in the library"; and "Improved reading comprehension."

How has ownership of RIF books had a positive effect on students?

Twenty-one teachers (41 percent of the sample) did not respond to this item. The majority of these were those teachers who did not strongly agree with the original statement that "...ownership of books has a positive effect on my students." The 30 teachers who did respond provided 31 responses, of which pride in ownership was mentioned most frequently (14 of the 31 responses, or 45 percent). Development of responsibility or independence was mentioned in 23 percent (7 of 31 responses), and increased enthusiasm for reading in 13 percent (4 of 31) of the responses. Other positive effects mentioned by teachers included the desire of students to start their own libraries, observations that students read their RIF books during their free time, and--in one case--decreased theft of school books.

Three of the 31 responses (10 percent) to this item mentioned negative effects of the ownership of books: One teacher indicated that some RIF books were left in students' lockers. Another hypothesized that any positive effects of the ownership of books were temporary--a rather safe assumption, which could be applied with equal validity to, say, food or clothing. And one teacher noted that some children traded books for toys--a "negative effect" only if one focuses on the recipient of the toy, rather than on the recipient of the book.

How do you use RIF books in class?

Recall that 39 teachers asserted that they do use RIF books in class. Eleven indicated that they do not, and one teacher did not respond. (The percentages here are 76, 22, and 2, respectively, of the 51-teacher sample.) The 39 teachers who indicated that they do use RIF books in class provided

44 responses to the question of how the books were used. These 44 responses mentioned the following classroom uses of RIF books:

1. Teacher reads RIF books to pupils (12 responses = 27 percent of 44).
2. Recreational reading (12 responses = 27 percent of 44).
3. Oral or written book reports (seven responses = 16 percent of 44).
4. As a basis for group discussion (six responses = 14 percent of 44).
5. As part of regular reading instruction (five responses = 11 percent of 44).
6. As part of individualized reading instruction (two responses = 5 percent of 44).

How do you encourage students to select and read RIF books?

This question was the second part of item 7 of the questionnaire: "I encourage my students to select and read RIF books. ____ Yes ____ No. How?" One teacher did not respond to the first part of the item. All 50 teachers who did respond to the first part of the item indicated that they do encourage their students to select and read RIF books, and provided a total of 30 responses to the second part of the item. These 30 responses indicated that the teachers used the following methods to encourage students to select and read RIF books.

1. Discussing choosing RIF books in class (18 responses = 60 percent of 30).
2. Telling pupils about the importance and fun of reading (four responses = 13 percent of 30).
3. Providing free time for reading RIF books (three responses = 10 percent of 30).
4. Giving stars for reading, making posters, and reading books in class (five responses = 17 percent of 30).

What were the favorable or unfavorable comments received from parents?*

Recall that only nine teachers indicated having received comments of any kind from the parents of the RIF participants. Four of these nine did not respond to the question of what kinds of favorable comments were received. The five teachers who did answer the question provided the following responses:

1. Excellent reading material (two responses).
2. Favorably impressed by low cost (two responses).
3. Children look forward to receiving RIF books (one response).

As noted previously, no teachers indicated having received unfavorable comments from parents.

Do you have any suggestions for improving the RIF program?

Thirty teachers (59 percent of the sample of 51) either indicated that they had no suggestions for improving the program, or did not respond to this item. That these teachers were not dissatisfied with the program can probably be assumed. The 21 teachers who did respond to this item provided the following suggestions for improving the RIF program:

1. Teachers should be permitted to assist students in choosing books (six teachers = 29 percent of 21).
2. The bookmobile visits should occur more frequently (four teachers = 19 percent of 21).
3. RIF should donate books to schools (three teachers = 14 percent of 21).
4. The number of "high-interest, low-vocabulary" books should be increased (three teachers = 14 percent of 21).
5. The selection of books of interest to sixth-grade girls should be increased (one teacher = 5 percent of 21).
6. Pupils should be given more time to select books (one teacher = 5 percent).

*This question appeared as two items on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

7. Teachers should be allowed to select books for absent children (one teacher = 5 percent).

8. The selection of cartoon books should be limited (one teacher = 5 percent).

9. The number of home visits should be increased (one teacher = 5 percent).*

Principal Questionnaires

As with the Teacher Questionnaire, the Principal Questionnaire was comprised of rating-scale, close-ended, and open-ended items. The rating-scale items consisted of six affirmative statements with which the principals were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement on a five-point scale, using a rating of one for strong disagreement and a rating of five for strong agreement. Summaries of the principals' responses to the rating-scale items are presented in Table 9. The ratings indicate considerable agreement (mean rating $\geq$ 4.25) on all of the following propositions:

1. They would like to see the RIF program continued in their schools.

2. The RIF program increased the variety of books available to students in their schools.

3. The RIF program encouraged students to read more.

4. The RIF program helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students.

5. The teachers support the RIF program.

The principals also agreed (mean rating = 4.0) that RIF increased the interaction between the school and parents.

The open- and close-ended items of the Principal Questionnaire are discussed in the following sections:

---

*The totals of reported percentages do not equal 100 in some cases, because of rounding.

TABLE 9

Principal Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items

Items:	Ratings					No Response	Weighted Σ/N	$\bar{X}$ Rating
	Strongly Disagree =1	Disagree =2	Neutral =3	Agree =4	Strongly Agree =5			
1. I would like to see the Reading is Fun program continued in my school.	0	0	1	3	17	0	100/21	4.75
2. The RIF program increases the variety of books available to students in my school.	0	0	1	8	12	0	95/21	4.50
3. I believe the RIF program has increased the interaction between the school and parents.	0	0	6	7	8	0	86/21	4.00
4. I believe the RIF program has encouraged students to read more.	0	1	2	9	9	0	89/21	4.25
5. I believe the RIF program has helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students.	0	0	1	13	7	0	90/21	4.25
6. Teachers in my school support the RIF program.	0	0	1	10	9	1	88/20	4.50

Notes:

1. Cell entries are the numbers of principals assigning to each item the ratings appearing at the column headings.
2. Weighted Σ = Sum of the cell entries x rating value for each item; N = number of principals responding to each item.
3. $\bar{X}$ ratings (= weighted Σ/N) rounded to the nearest 0.25.

Why would you like to see RIF continued?

Four principals (19 percent of the sample of 21) did not respond to this item. The 17 principals who did respond provided one answer each. The 17 responses reflected the following reasons for continuing RIF:

1. Importance of owning books (nine responses = 53 percent of 17).
2. Importance of reading books other than those available from school (five responses = 29 percent of 17).
3. Maintenance of students' enthusiasm for RIF (three responses = 18 percent of 17).

Suggested changes in RIF.

Ten principals did not respond to this item, and two responded by saying that no change was necessary. Five principals suggested expanding the program, by increasing the frequency of bookmobile visits, or extending it to other grades. One may assume, therefore, that 17 principals (81 percent of 21) were not dissatisfied with the program. Four respondents suggested the following changes in the program:

1. Permit teachers to help pupils select books (two responses).
2. Publicize RIF more (one response).
3. "Change personnel" (one response).

How did RIF increase interaction between parents and school?

Three of the 21 principals (14 percent) did not respond to this item, and one (5 percent of 21) responded by saying that he had observed no evidence of increased interaction. Three principals (14 percent of 21) indicated that "too few" parents had assisted in the distribution of books. Thus, a total of seven respondents (33 percent of 21) did not mention or were not particularly impressed with the extent to which RIF had increased interaction between the school and parents. Of the remaining 14 principals (67 percent of 21) eight (38 percent of 21) indicated that parents had helped to distribute RIF books, and six (29 percent of 21) mentioned parents' awareness of the program as indicated by telephone and face-to-face comments.

In what ways do you believe that RIF encouraged students to read?

Four principals (19 percent of 21), all of whom did not strongly agree that RIF had encouraged children to read, did not answer this question. The 17 principals who did answer provided the following kinds of responses:

1. Freedom of choice encouraged reading (nine responses = 53 percent of 17).
2. Children were observed exchanging RIF books (three responses = 18 percent of 17).
3. Children were observed reading RIF books (two responses = 12 percent of 17).
4. The novelty of RIF books as compared to school books encouraged reading (one response = 6 percent of 17).
5. Teachers encouraged children to read RIF books (one response).
6. Children wrote reports on RIF books (one response).

How did teachers support RIF?

Two principals (9.5 percent of 21) did not respond to this item. The 19 principals who did respond mentioned the following ways in which teachers supported RIF:

1. Conducting class discussions and requiring book reports (five responses = 26 percent of 19).
2. Cooperating with program activities and personnel (five responses = 26 percent of 19).
3. Encouraging pupils to read (four responses = 21 percent of 19).
4. Encouraging pupils to share RIF books (three responses = 16 percent of 19).
5. Buying books for "reading corner" (one response = 5 percent of 19).
6. Showing interest in pupils' selections (one response = 5 percent of 19).

What does your school do to inform the students about the Reading is Fun program and Reading is Fun days?

All 21 principals answered this item, providing a total of 31 responses. The responses were as follow:

1. Written announcements to parents (11 responses = 35 percent of 31).
2. Posters in school, leaflets to children (nine responses = 29 percent of 31).
3. Announcements by teachers in class (five responses = 16 percent of 31).
4. Announcements via the school intercom (three responses = 10 percent of 31).
5. Announcements at PTA meetings (one response = 3 percent of 31).
6. Community newspaper (one response = 3 percent of 31).
7. "Nothing specific" (one response = 3 percent of 31).

Parents' comments about RIF.

Fourteen principals (67 percent of 21) responded affirmatively to the question, "Have you received many comments from parents on the RIF program?" The remaining seven principals (33 percent) said no. The results of the inquiry into the number and nature of favorable and unfavorable comments were as follow:

1. No unfavorable comments were reported.
2. The number of favorable comments could not be determined because some of the principals used non-quantitative estimates (for example, "many," "few") in their responses.
3. The 14 favorable comments reported by the principals all consisted of expressions of appreciation for the program.
4. Two principals reported having received questions from parents: One mother wondered whether RIF would be continued next year,

and another asked whether children who were absent on the day of a bookmobile visit could still receive books.

Librarian Questionnaires

The Librarian Questionnaire was comprised of five rating-scale items, two close-ended, yes-or-no questions, and two open-ended questions. As with the Teacher and the Principal Questionnaires, the rating-scale items of the Librarian Questionnaire consisted of affirmative statements with which respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement on a scale from one (strong disagreement) to five (strong agreement). The results of the librarians' responses to the rating-scale items are shown in Table 10. Most agreement (mean rating = 4.25) was found on the two propositions:

1. The RIF program helped to motivate students to read more.
2. Overall, the RIF program had been successful.

Slightly less agreement (mean rating = 4.0) was found with respect to the propositions:

1. RIF increased the variety of books available to students.
2. RIF helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students.

Finally, the librarians assigned a mean rating 3.50 -- midway between "neutral" and "agree" -- to the proposition that the RIF program had helped to increase the circulation of the schools' library books.

Thirteen of the librarians (76 percent of the sample of 17) responded affirmatively to the question, "Do you feel the RIF program has helped you attain any of your goals regarding the school library?" The remaining four librarians (24 percent) said no.

The 13 librarians who indicated that RIF had helped to achieve library goals gave the following reasons for their assertion:

1. RIF stimulated students' interest in reading (six responses = 46 percent of 13).

TABLE 10

Librarian Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Rating-Scale Items

Items:	Ratings: Strongly Disagree =1	Disagree =2	Neutral =3	Agree =4	Strongly Agree =5	Don't Know	Weighted Σ/N	$\bar{X}$ Rating
1. I believe the RIF program has increased the variety of books available to students in my school.	0	3	1	6	7	0	68/17	4.00
2. I believe RIF has helped increase the circulation of our own school library.	0	2	6	5	3	1	57/16	3.50
3. I believe the RIF program has helped to motivate students in my school to read more.	0	0	3	7	5	2	62/15	4.25
4. I believe the RIF program has helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students in my school.	0	0	4	7	6	0	70/17	4.00
5. Overall, I believe the RIF program has been successful.	0	0	3	6	8	0	73/17	4.25

Notes:

1. Cell entries are the numbers of librarians assigning to each item, the ratings appear at the column headings.
2. Weighted Σ = Sum of the cell entries x rating value for each item; N = number of librarians responding to each item.
3. $\bar{X}$ ratings (= weighted Σ/N) rounded to nearest 0.25.

2. Students withdrew library books with topics related to their RIF books (two responses = 15 percent of 13).

3. Circulation of library books increased concommitantly with introduction of the RIF program (two responses = 15 percent of 13).

4. The RIF program provided summer reading material for students (one response = 8 percent of 13).

5. Students wrote reports on RIF books (one response = 8 percent of 13).

6. RIF increased the variety of books available to students (one response = 8 percent).

In response to the question on whether or not RIF had inhibited the attainment of library goals, four librarians (24 percent) responded affirmatively, 12 (71 percent) responded negatively, and one (6 percent) did not respond. Two of the four librarians who asserted that RIF inhibited attainment of their libraries' goals did not respond to the question of how this inhibition was accomplished. Of the remaining two, one indicated that the competition from RIF had caused decreased circulation of her school's library books, and one asserted that RIF should donate books to libraries.

Parent Questionnaires

The Parent Questionnaire was comprised of ten close-ended, yes-or-no questions, and several open-ended items. The major results of the close-ended items, summarized in Table 11, were as follow:

1. Ninety-one percent of the 22-parent sample reported that their children had read the RIF selections.

2. Thirty-two percent of the parents were able to recall at least one title of an RIF book that her child had read. These seven parents were able to recall a total of 14 titles of their children's favorite RIF books.

3. Seventy-three percent of the parents reported that they had read or looked through their children's RIF books.

TABLE 11

Parent Questionnaire: Summary of Responses to Close-Ended Items

Items:	Numbers		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Did your child read the books he selected in Reading is Fun?	20	2	91	9
2. Do you know the titles of the books?*	7	15	32	68
3. Have you read or looked through your child's books?	16	6	73	27
4. Does your child enjoy the Reading is Fun books?	20	2	91	9
5. Does your child enjoy owning the Reading is Fun books?	20	2	91	9
6. Does he keep them in a special place?	20	2	91	9
7. Does your child have a special place to read?	12	10	55	45
8. Does your child read more than he used to read?	21	1	95	5
9. Does he like to talk about the books with you?	16	6	73	27
10. Do you think the Reading is Fun program has helped your child?	22	0	100	0

*Item 2b: Number of titles mentioned = 14.

4. Ninety-one percent of the parents reported that their children
   A. Enjoy reading the RIF books,
   B. Enjoy owning the RIF books, and
   C. Keep their RIF books in a special place.
5. Fifty-five percent of the parents indicated that their children have a special place to read.
6. Ninety-five percent of the parents reported that their children read more than they used to (before the introduction of RIF).
7. Seventy-three percent of the parents indicated that their children liked to discuss their RIF books with them.
8. All 22 parents thought that the RIF program had helped their children in some way.

Nine of the parents (41 percent) specified reasons why their children enjoyed reading their RIF books:

1. Because he or she enjoys reading to others in the family (three responses = 33 percent of nine).
2. Because reading the books gives them something different to do (three responses = 33 percent of nine).
3. Because he or she likes to read all books (one response = 11 percent on nine).
4. Because he or she likes what the characters do and say (one response = 11 percent).
5. Because reading RIF books is "voluntary" (one response = 11 percent).

Eighteen parents (82 percent) responded to the question, "How has the Reading is Fun program helped your child?" The following classes of answers were given:

1. By increasing the chilren's interest in reading, as evidenced by an increase in the amount of reading done, verbal expressions of enthusiasm for RIF, or both (14 responses = 78 percent of 18).

2. By supplying books other than textbooks for children to read (three responses = 17 percent of 18).

3. By increasing the child's knowledge about a particular topic (one response = six percent).

When asked to give a general opinion of RIF, all 22 parents expressed appreciation for the beneficial effects of the program or provided other favorable comments; that is, no unfavorable opinions were offered by the parents. The following five remarks were selected randomly from the parents' comments:

1. "It helped all my children read better."

2. "I think the program is good."

3. "Fine. I think the aides did well under the circumstances."

4. "I like it fine. Wish it would continue. It improves his reading."

5. "I liked it. Really did. The children loved John (the Student Aide). Looked forward to his visit."

The parents' unanimously favorable opinion of RIF was further substantiated by their answers to the question on suggestions for improving the program. Fourteen parents (64 percent) made no suggestions for improvement. All eight parents (36 percent) who did suggest improvements recommended continuation or expansion (increasing the frequency of home visits, for example) of the program.

Effects of Home Visits

As indicated previously, a part of the Pittsburgh RIF program consisted of visits to the homes of some of the RIF participants by Student Aides, who performed a variety of functions presumably appropriate to increasing children's interest in reading for pleasure. Each of seven aides made one visit per week to the home of each of his or her assigned students for six or, in some cases, seven consecutive weeks. All students who received the visits were from Letsche School. Because of the extra costs and efforts involved in the home visits, a question naturally arises as to whether the

efforts of the Student Aides were demonstrably effective. An experiment was designed to answer this question.

An experimental group of 29 first- through sixth-graders who received home visits, and a control group of 29 first- through sixth-graders, receiving no visits, and matched with respect to grade-levels, were selected. In order to make the groups comparable in terms of the number of RIF books received by each student, all subjects who had received more or less than six books were discarded from the sample. This procedure resulted in seven deletions from the experimental (home visits) group, and eleven from the control (no home visits) group. Thus the two groups used in the experiment consisted of 22 experimental subjects and 18 control subjects, each of whom had received six RIF books.

Individual interviews were conducted with each subject in both groups, during which a member of the AIR staff asked the students several questions about the contents of their books. The questions focused on the books' main characters, how the stories ended, and what the books were about. The resulting interview protocols were reviewed by the Letsche School librarian, who was familiar with all of the subjects' books, and who made a determination as to how many of the books each subject had read completely, and how many books each student had started but not completed. The librarian was not apprised of which subjects had or had not received the home visits.

The mean number of books read by the experimental group was 3.1, as compared to a mean of 1.6 for the controls. A one-tailed Mann-Whitney U test (Siegel, 1956) was used to analyze the data generated by the procedures described above. The difference between the mean numbers of books read by the two groups was found to be statistically significant at the .975 level of confidence ($p = .025$).*

An analysis identical to the one performed on the mean numbers of books read by the two groups was performed for the mean numbers of books started but not completed by members of the experimental and control groups. In this case, the respective means were .81 and .75, the difference between which proved not to be statistically significant ($p > .5$).

*A p value of .025 means that the odds against the results of the experiment having occurred by chance are 40:1.

The results of the two analyses described above clearly demonstrate that the home visits:

1. Affected significantly the mean number of books read by the beneficiaries of the home visits, as compared to the number of books read by children receiving no visits.
2. Had no effect upon the mean number of books started but not completed by the two groups.

Additional insights into the effects of the home visits were provided by interviews with the Student Aides. All seven Student Aides responded affirmatively to questions as to whether they believed the home visits to have been effective. The aides cited several indicators of the effectiveness of the visits, including positive comments from families of RIF participants, children's enthusiasm, noticeably improved reading skills, and voluntary reading in addition to reading RIF books.

The aides agreed that the program was not particularly effective with parents, but--naturally--was more effective for some parents than for others. Some parents were never present during the aides' visits.

Among the techniques used by the Student Aides during the visits were reading and discussing the books, having children write and look up words that they didn't know, taking turns reading with the children, and reading the whole book first and then having the child read it. Two of the seven aides emphasized the importance of relating the contents of books to tangible everyday experience, and provided unequivocal evidence of their belief in this principle: One of the two aides took his RIF charge horseback riding after they had read A Pony for Marly. The other of the two aides lent substance to the contents of an elementary botany book by helping his reader raise a tomato plant.

When asked what changes they would make in the home-visit aspects of RIF, the aides suggested the following modifications:

1. Increased pay for Student Aides.
2. None.
3. Change the place of the visits, because some homes were "...so bad that there wasn't anyplace I could sit down and read with the children."

4. Fewer reports and meetings with RIF administrators, and more visits with children.

5. More training for the Student Aides.

All seven aides agreed that the home visits should be continued; their comments as to why included:

1. "Most of the kids really needed some help."

2. "The parents were requesting that it be continued."

3. "It should be continued and expanded....even take it to different areas, not just poverty kids."

4. "It was a good experience for me besides for the kids."

The interview data, coupled with the results of the experimental comparisons, permit little doubt as to the effectiveness of the home visits.

Effects of High and Low Reading Achievement

As mentioned in the Method section of this report, a question arose as to whether the RIF program would benefit good readers more than poor readers. An experiment, identical in all respects but one to the study of home-visit effects, was designed to answer this question. The difference between the two experiments was, of course, in the basis for assigning subjects to the two groups. In the present experiment the two groups were formed on the basis of teachers' judgments as to whether each subject was in the upper or lower half of his or her class in reading achievement. As in the previous experiment, all subjects who received more or less than six books were discarded from the sample, with the librarian determining how many RIF books each subject had read completely, and how many books had been begun but not completed. The two comparison groups in this case consisted of 16 students assigned by their teachers to the upper halves of their classes in reading achievement, and of 24 students assigned to the lower halves.

The mean number of books read by the upper-half group was 2.7, as compared to 2.4 for the lower-half group. The former group began but did not complete a mean of .81 books; the lower-half group, .75 books. Mann-Whitney

U tests showed neither of these differences to be statistically significant ($p > .4$). The assumption that RIF differentially affects good readers and poor readers--at least in terms of numbers of books read, or numbers begun but not completed--seems unwarranted.

Ancillary Data

In all studies which depend on data from a variety of sources, the data from some sources prove less illuminating than data from others. The present study was no exception. Three kinds of data were obtained which proved to be of little value for evaluating the extent to which RIF objectives were being met.

The Student Aides wrote summary reports of each of their home visits. The reports were in all cases conscientiously prepared and interesting to read. They described extremes of success (one child who was "too shy" to read aloud during the first visit read an entire book aloud during the next visit) and of failure (nobody home at the appointed hour), but very few consistent trends could be observed. Notable exceptions to this absence of consistent trends were the uniform optimism and self-satisfaction of the aides, and in the great majority of cases, the enthusiasm of the children about the visits and the books. Fortunately the Student-Aide reports were not essential to an examination of the effectiveness of home visits, which was amply demonstrated by the previously reported experimental comparison. The investigators are therefore inclined to agree with the Student Aide who expressed the opinion that aides should spend less time writing reports, and more time making home visits.

Book reports were solicited from students in the participating schools. Three-hundred-thirty reports were received from 20 schools with a total enrollment of about 4600. The investigators have spent many delightful hours reading the reports, which in the final analysis were found to contain very little information relevant to an evaluation of progress toward RIF goals. Predictably, the reports were of highly variable quality, ranging from perfectly grammatical prose on the one hand to verbatim copying of a book's contents on the other. Whenever the writers of the book reports commented on how they liked their books, the comments were favorable--also a predictable

outcome, as most of the reports were written voluntarily. Whether or not the writing of book reports helps to make reading fun seems highly debatable--even if the writing is "voluntary."

Finally, the question of possible differential effects of the RIF program upon good and poor readers arose in another context: Given the opportunity to purchase new books for 10¢ each, would good readers buy more books than poor readers? To answer this question a comparison was performed between the mean numbers of books purchased by two groups of Baxter School fourth- and sixth-graders assigned by their teachers to the upper or lower halves of their classes in reading achievement. The mean number of books purchased by the 25 subjects who comprised the upper-half group was 4.4, as compared to 3.3 for the 26 subjects in the lower-half group. Results of a Mann-Whitney U test showed this difference to be significant at the .93 level of confidence (p = .07). The reasons for this difference are unclear. Studies should be performed to determine the reasons why high-rated readers bought more books than low-rated readers, and to permit inference about the direction of causality--for example, do low-rated readers buy fewer books because they are poor readers, or are they poor readers because they buy fewer books? One might find that the parents of high-rated readers are more affluent than the parents of low-rated readers--in which case consideration might be given to abandoning the current RIF practice of charging for books. Finally, one might ask whether a statistically significant difference between 3.3 books and 4.4 books really has sufficient practical significance to warrant procedural changes in the Pittsburgh RIF program, or additional studies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several action recommendations, none of which involve extensive changes in current RIF operating procedures, can be made on the basis of the evaluation reported herein:

1. The Pittsburgh RIF program should be continued or expanded.

Many benefits seem to have been promulagated by the program, with no noticeable undesirable side effects. The investigators, therefore, recommend that it be continued. Several suggestions for improving the RIF program were made by members of the questionnaire samples and by the Student Aides. The only suggestions that occurred with great frequency were for continuing and expanding the program.

The investigators are inclined to minimize suggestions for more teacher participation in students' selection of books, and for RIF to donate books to schools. The first of these suggestions seems at odds with stated RIF objectives: Increasing teacher participation would probably decrease some children's freedom to select books. The second suggestion may have merit, but may also be at odds with RIF objectives: Donating books to schools might increase motivation to read, but would not increase student ownership of books. This is a problem in priority-assignment, which the RIF staff will have to solve.

2. The home visits should be continued or expanded.

The home visits were particularly effective in motivating the children to read. Twice as many books were read by children who received visits than by children who did not. The question of why the home visits were effective is one which the present study was not designed to answer, and on which every reader of this report probably will have an opinion. In weighing these opinions, the RIF staff should consider that the home visits may have been the only part of the Pittsburgh RIF program in which the actual reading behavior of students was closely and frequently followed by pleasant consequences. Consistent reinforcement is a sufficient condition for the occurrence of learning. If the enjoyment of reading is related to the ability to read, then the RIF staff should explore all possible avenues for

attaching positive, immediate, and frequent consequences to students' reading behavior, because only by doing so will it be possible to teach children that reading is fun. An obvious implication here is that books might be used as reinforcers for reading behavior; that is, the acquisition of a book might be made contingent upon demonstrating that another book has been read. Obtaining evidence that reading behavior has occurred requires the involvement of a party other than the reader--which, once again, may be taken as an argument for the expansion of home visits.

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, the investigators wish to emphasize the point that is being made here: The RIF staff is directly engaged in the business of modifying behavior. Efficient behavior modification involves:

A. Specifying exactly the behavior (not just feelings) that one is attempting to produce.

B. Providing conditions that will permit or cause the occurrence of the desired behavior.

C. Providing frequent reinforcement (pleasant consequences) for the desired behavior.

Two questions must be answered:

A. What behavior will be taken as evidence of the occurrence of reading?

B. How can the desired behavior be reinforced, once it has occurred?

Once these questions are answered, half the battle of teaching children to enjoy reading will have been won. Notice the implications of this discussion for all facets of RIF activities. On home visits: Shall we leave Student Aides to their own devices in dealing with children? Or could better results be achieved by training Student Aides in principles of behavior modification? On bookmobile visits: What behavior is reinforced when the children are given books--reading behavior or being at the appointed place at the appointed time? On RIF objectives: What behavior are students who "enjoy reading" or are "motivated to read" expected to demonstrate?

The considerations discussed above lead to a third recommendation:

3. Ongoing efforts to increase the specificity of RIF objectives should be continued.

As implied in the previous recommendation, particular emphasis should be given to specifying the behavior associated with each program objective. Mager's (1962) program is an excellent source of information on specifying behavioral objectives. Future evaluations of RIF should begin with specification of objectives before the to-be-evaluated activities are performed. Such an approach would serve to sharpen the focus of RIF activities, and to increase the objectivity of the evaluation.

4. The parent objectives should be reviewed and modified to capitalize upon the good will created by the RIF program.

Indications were obtained that the RIF parent objectives were not being met as well as the student and teacher objectives. The parent objectives involve a behavior modification problem of extreme difficulty--a problem for the solution of which the Pittsburgh RIF budget is probably insufficient. The parent objectives should, therefore, be reviewed in order to determine if modifications or deletions are desirable. Should RIF, for example, devote part of its resources to trying to increase parents' motivation to read? The investigators think not. Notice, however, that all parents in the sample either made no suggestions for the improvement of RIF, or suggested expanding the program; and no parents commented unfavorably. These parents represent a potential manpower pool which is in basic agreement with RIF goals and activities. The RIF staff should, therefore, consider possible ways to capitalize upon and increase the good will they have created. Satisfied parents could serve as volunteer Student Aides, for example.

5. The reason for two-thirds of the students having reported that they had a "hard time" finding RIF books that they wanted to read should be explored in depth, in order to determine causes of the reported difficulty.

This could probably be accomplished by informal interviews with a small number of children who responded affirmatively to the first item of the Student Questionnaire. If these interviews indicate that the book topics are not consistent with students' interests, then attempts should be made to

generate interest profiles for the various grade levels as a basis for future book purchasing by RIF. These profiles should not be generated solely on the basis of students' verbal reports. Rather, primary consideration should be given to the kinds of books purchased by students.

6. The ten-cents-per-book policy should be examined in light of the finding that high-rated readers bought more books than low-rated readers.

Experimental investigations of this issue would be interesting but costly. Therefore, no additional research is recommended. Rather, the RIF staff and Board of Directors should decide whether or not to continue the ten-cents-per-book policy by discussing:

A. Whether any children--high-rated or low-rated readers--are being denied access to books because of the policy. Teachers' opinions should be solicited on this issue.

B. Is the 25 percent difference between the numbers of books purchased by high-rated and low-rated readers of sufficient importance to warrant procedural changes in the program?

C. To what extent is income from the sale of books necessary for continuing the work of RIF?

7. Book reports from students and home-visit reports from Student Aides should not be used in future evaluations of RIF.

In their present form these reports may provide useful management data for the program staff, but are of little value in evaluating progress toward RIF objectives.

8. Subsequent evaluations of RIF should include comparisons between the reading behavior of program participants and non-participants.

Such an evaluation might be more costly than the present one, but could provide unequivocal evidence of the benefits of RIF.

Appendix A

Student Questionnaire

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ School 3rd Letsch

		(Check one)
1.	Did you have a hard time finding books at Reading is Fun that you wanted to read? Like Baseball, basketball	✓ Yes ___ No
2.	Do you have fun reading the books you picked out?	✓ Yes ___ No
3.	Have you tried to find other books like them in the library?	___ Yes ✓ No
4.	Have you asked your mother or father or other grown-up person to buy you some more books?	___ Yes ✓ No
5.	Do you have a special place to keep your books?	✓ Yes ___ No
6.	Have any of your friends read your books?	✓ Yes ___ No
7.	Do you read their books?	✓ Yes ___ No
8.	Have any members of your family read your books? Who? sister	✓ Yes ___ No
9.	Do you talk about the books with your friends?	___ Yes ✓ No
10.	Do you like to read?	✓ Yes ___ No

Appendix B

Teacher Questionnaire

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Grade and School Baxter Second Grade.

Please circle the number that best expresses your judgment:

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	I think the RIF program has helped to improve the reading performance of my students.	1	2	(3)	4	5
2.	I believe the RIF program has increased the students' enjoyment of books.	1	2	3	(4)	5
3.	I think RIF has helped to motivate my students to read.	1	2	3	(4)	5

How? Just having interesting books on hand to read.

4.	I think the ownership of books has a positive effect on my students.	1	2	3	(4)	5

How? By giving them pride in the fact that they have authority over this book.

5.	I believe the RIF program is worthwhile.	1	2	3	4	(5)

6. I use RIF books the children have selected as a part of my classroom activities. ✓Yes ___No

How? During story hour I read a portion of several books to build up interest and curosity,

7. I encourage my students to select and read RIF books. ✓Yes ___No

How? I give them a chance to show their books off, and talk about them after reading it.

55

(over)

8. Have parents commented about the RIF program? ___Yes ___No

Approximate number of parents making favorable comments: _____

What were the comments? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Approximate number of parents making unfavorable comments: _____

What were the comments?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Do you have any suggestions for improving the RIF program?

I would like to see this program make more books available to teachers for their classroom libraries. When children are introduced to books at school in their homerooms, they enjoy owning the book to reread for themselves

Appendix C

Principal Questionnaire

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ School School

Please circle the number that best expresses your judgment.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	I would like to see the Reading is Fun program continued in my school.	1	2	3	(4)	5

Why? _____

_____

_____

Suggested changes: _____

If there is more help from the spensering group. Teachers should be permitted to help children select books. Some children took books much too easy or too difficult for them.

2.	The RIF program increases the variety of books available to students in my school.	1	2	3	(4)	5

we have a very good variety of books in our school library

3.	I believe the RIF program has increased the interaction between the school and parents.	1	2	3	(4)	5

In what ways? Some parents helped with the distribution. Most of the work fell to the aide who is not a parent of children in Schiller

4.	I believe the RIF program has encouraged students to read more.	1	2	3	(4)	5

Why? They were encouraged to read their books by their teacher. Our teachers always encourage children to read

(over)

5. I believe the RIF program has helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students. 1 2 3 (4) 5

6. Teachers in my school support the RIF program. 1 2 3 (4) 5

How? Encouraging the children to read and "share" their books. Teachers were not permitted to help children select books.

7. What does your school do to inform the students about the Reading is Fun program and Reading is Fun days?

Posters by students, teacher-pupil discussions

8. Have you received many comments from parents on the RIF program? ___Yes ✓No

Favorable

Approximately how many? Our parents are apathetic

Nature of comments: Those who helped distribute were very interested and enthusiastic about the program. Parents commented favorably only when asked.*

Unfavorable

Approximately how many? _____

Nature of comments: _____

* The childrens enthusiasm was more evident than parents. Parents did give children money to buy the books from the book mobile.

Appendix D

Librarian Questionnaire

LIBRARIAN QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ School Baxter

Please circle the number that best expresses your judgment.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1.	I believe the RIF program has increased the variety of books available to students in my school.	1	2	3	4	(5)	6
2.	I believe RIF has helped increase the circulation of our own school library books.	1	2	3	4	(5)	6
3.	I believe the RIF program has helped to motivate students in my school to read more.	1	2	3	4	(5)	6
4.	I believe the RIF program has helped develop an enjoyment of reading in students in my school.	1	2	3	(4)	5	6
5.	Overall, I believe the RIF program has been successful.	1	2	3	4	(5)	6

6. Do you feel the RIF program has helped you attain any of your goals regarding the school library? ✓ Yes ___ No

If yes, please list how: Circulation has increased and the enthusiasm for reading is much higher.

7. Do you feel the RIF program has inhibited the attainment of any of your goals regarding the school library? ___ Yes ✓ No

If yes, please list how: _____

Appendix E

Parent Questionnaire

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____

Child's (Children's) Name(s) and School: Letasha

_____ _____

_____ _____

1. Did your child read the books he selected in Reading is Fun? ✓ Yes ___ No

2. Do you know the titles of the books? ✓ Yes ___ No
What are they? Robin Hood, Heidi, Kites are Fun
Nerget Head Max

_____

3. Have you read or looked through your child's books? ✓ Yes ___ No

4. Does your child enjoy the Reading is Fun books? ✓ Yes ___ No
Why? She reads them to Donna and explains them. Donna always runs home excited when she gets more books.

Which book did he like the best? Heidi, Mother Goose

5. Does your child enjoy owning the Reading is Fun books? ✓ Yes ___ No

6. Does he keep them in a special place? ✓ Yes ___ No

7. Does your child have a special place to read? ___ Yes ✓ No

8. Does your child read more than he used to? ✓ Yes ___ No

9. Does he like to talk about the books with you? ✓ Yes ___ No

10. Do you think the Reading is Fun program has helped your child? ✓ Yes ___ No
How? She's more interested in books.

_____

11. What is your opinion of the Reading is Fun program? It's a
wonderful thing it advances the child
with extra help

(over)

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving it?

No - its fine the way it is

Appendix F

Schools Participating in the Pittsburgh RIF Program

Schools Participating in the Pittsburgh RIF Program

1. Baxter
2. Hall's Grove
3. Fineview
4. Schiller
5. Gladstone
6. Letsche
7. Conroy
8. Clayton
9. Friendship
10. East Park
11. East Street
12. Madison
13. Fort Pitt
14. Northview
15. Homewood
16. Lincoln
17. Vann
18. Crescent
19. Spring Garden
20. Lemington
21. Weil
22. Larimer
23. Cowley
24. Miller
25. Belmar
26. McKelvy
27. Burgwin
28. Fairywood

Appendix G

Numbers of RIF Books Available by Categories by Reading Levels

Numbers of RIF Books Available by Categories by Reading Levels

Reading Level 1

1.	Easy Reader	30
2.	Picture	38
3.	Animal	1
4.	Picture Reference	1
5.	Picture Activity	1
6.	Reference	1
7.	Picture Favorite	1

Reading Level 2

1.	Alphabet	1
2.	Favorite	20
3.	Fantasy Classic	1
4.	Science	9
5.	Easy Reader	70
6.	Picture	26
7.	Ethnic Picture	5
8.	Contemporary Fiction	2
9.	Animal	1
10.	Rhymes	1
11.	Religion	1
12.	Reference	4
13.	Ethnic Fiction	1
14.	Ethnic History Fiction	1
15.	Humor	3
16.	Animal Favorites	1
17.	Classic	1
18.	Activity	3
19.	Animal Fiction	4
20.	Counting Picture	1
21.	Fiction	3
22.	Riddles	1
23.	Science Picture	1

Reading Level 3

1.	Science Picture	1
2.	Favorite	32
3.	Animal Favorite	4
4.	Ethnic Picture	3
5.	Animal	8
6.	Picture	16
7.	Poetry	7
8.	Girls' Fiction	1
9.	Ethnic Fiction	3
10.	Easy Reader	14
11.	Social Studies	3
12.	Ethnic Activity	1
13.	Ethnic Talktale	2
14.	Science	6
15.	Fiction	4
16.	Ethnic Biography	1
17.	Religion	2
18.	Science Activity	1
19.	Activity	5
20.	Biography	1
21.	Biblical	1
22.	Animal Fiction	4
23.	Contemporary Fiction	1
24.	Mystery	1
25.	Counting Picture	1
26.	Humor	1
27.	Ethnic Biography	1
28.	Ethnic History Fiction	1
29.	Sports Fiction	1

Numbers of RIF Books Available by Categories by Reading Levels

Reading Level 4

1.	Animal Favorite	1
2.	Picture	2
3.	Classic	3
4.	Science	29
5.	Fantasy	17
6.	Social Studies	1
7.	Urban Fiction	2
8.	Animal	9
9.	Ethnic Contemporary Fiction	11
10.	Sports Activity	1
11.	Humor	21
12.	Career	1
13.	Activity	7
14.	Information	1
15.	Sports Non-Fiction	2
16.	Biography	5
17.	Contemporary Fiction	10
18.	Adventure	10
19.	Sports	1
20.	Historic Fiction	6
21.	Sports Reference	5
22.	Myth	1
23.	Sports Fiction	5
24.	Girls' Fiction	14
25.	Reference	2
26.	Sports Humor	1
27.	Girls' Humor	2
28.	Mystery	8
29.	Animal Fantasy	3
30.	Ethnic Biology	8
31.	Cartoon	4
32.	Poetry	4
33.	Animal Humor	2
34.	Animal Fiction	1
35.	Talktales	1
36.	Animal Mystery	1
37.	Sports Mystery	1
38.	Science Fiction	1
39.	Contemporary Activity	1
40.	Ethnic History Fiction	2
41.	Ethnic History	1

Reading Level 5

1.	History	2
2.	History Fiction	13
3.	Fantasy	18
4.	Boys' Fiction	1
5.	Girls' Fiction	21
6.	Girls' Humor	1
7.	Ethnic Urban Fiction	1
8.	Humor	19
9.	Activity	10
10.	Poetry	2
11.	Collective Biography	1
12.	Science	27
13.	Sports	1
14.	Reference	4
15.	Animal	23
16.	Sports Non-Fiction	2
17.	Sports Biography	1
18.	Sports Reference	8
19.	Contemporary Fiction	25
20.	Biography	6
21.	Mystery	28
22.	Sports Fiction	7
23.	Science Fiction	10
24.	Far Places	3
25.	Adventure	7
26.	Ethnic History	8
27.	Ethnic Science Biography	3
28.	Classic	7
29.	Ethnic Career	16
30.	Ethnic Contemporary Fiction	13
31.	Ethnic Adventure	1
32.	Music	1
33.	Ethnic Sports Fiction	1
34.	Mythology	2
35.	Ethnic History Fiction	1
36.	Animal Fiction	1
37.	Mystery Fantasy	1
38.	Animal Classic	1
39.	Religious	1
40.	Ethnic Poetry	1
41.	Fantasy Humor	1
42.	Talktales	1
43.	Legend	1
44.	Adventure Classic	3
45.	Girls' Classic	1
46.	Western	1
47.	Sports Humor	1

Numbers of RIF Books Available by Categories by Reading Levels

Reading Level 6

1.	Ethnic History Fiction	1
2.	Classic	10
3.	Sports Non-Fiction	5
4.	Ethnic Human Fiction	1
5.	Adventure	1
6.	Ethnic Biography	9
7.	Sports Biography	4
8.	Sports Fiction	3
9.	Sports Reference	1
10.	Animal	13
11.	Ethnic Sports Biography	1
12.	Ethnic History	4
13.	Ethnic History Fiction	3
14.	Legend	2
15.	Ethnic Career	4
16.	Adventure	4
17.	Ethnic Career Fiction	1
18.	Humor	11
19.	Fantasy	2
20.	Reference	3
21.	Far Places	1
22.	Contemporary Fiction	7
23.	Ethnic Contemporary Fiction	5
24.	Mystery	3
25.	Science	7
26.	Science Fiction	8
27.	Mythology	2
28.	Ethnic Sports Fiction	1
29.	Historical Fiction	4
30.	Ethnic Historical Fiction	3
31.	Cartoon	1
32.	Mystery Adventure	1
33.	Activity Reference	1
32.	Poetry	1
33.	Activity	2
34.	Music	2
35.	History	1
36.	Sports Reference	1
37.	Girls' Fiction	4

Reading Level 7

1.	Classic	1
2.	Humor	3
3.	Sports Fiction	2
4.	Sports Non-Fiction	3
5.	Science Fiction	2
6.	Sports Biography	1
7.	Ethnic Contemporary Fiction	3
8.	Ethnic Biography	1
9.	Biography	2
10.	Historical Fiction	2
11.	Mystery	1
12.	Sports Reference	1
13.	Ethnic Poetry	1
14.	Activity	1
15.	Ethnic Biography	1
16.	Humor	1
17.	Ethnic Sports Fiction	1
18.	Reference	3
19.	Girls' Fiction	2
20.	Ethnic Sports Biography	1
21.	Ethnic History	1

REFERENCES

Mager, R. F. Preparing instructional objectives. Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Morgan, L. Reading is fundamental. Evaluation of phase I. Chatham College.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956